for this season. Shipments of new crop potatoes from the production area are expected to begin about mid-July. The requirements provided herein are necessary to prevent potatoes of lower quality, undesirable sizes, and potatoes of lesser maturities from being distributed in fresh market channels, so as to improve returns to producers for the preferred qualities and sizes pursuant to the declared policy of the act.

It is hereby further found that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this section until 30 days after its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 553) in that (1) shipments of 1971 crop potatoes grown in the production area will begin on or about the effective date specified herein, (2) to maximize benefits to producers, this regulation should apply to as many shipments as possible during the effective period, (3) information regarding the provisions of this regulation, which are similar to those which were in effect during the previous marketing season, has been made available to producers and handlers in the production area since June 16, 1971, and (4) compliance with this regulation will not require any special preparation on the part of persons subject thereto which cannot be completed by such effective date.

§ 946.326 Limitation of shipments.

During the period July 16, 1971, through July 15, 1972, no person shall handle any lot of potatoes unless such potatoes meet the requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section, or unless such potatoes are handled in accordance with paragraphs (c) through (f) of this section.

(a) *Minimum quality requirements*—(1) *Grade.* All varieties—U.S. No. 2, or better grade.

(2) *Size.* (i) Round varieties—1⅞ inches minimum diameter.

(ii) Long varieties—2 inches minimum diameter or 4 ounces minimum weight.

(3) *Cleanliness.* All varieties—at least "fairly clean."

(b) *Minimum maturity requirements*—(1) *Round and White Rose varieties.* Not more than "moderately skinned."

(2) *Other long varieties (including but not limited to Russet, Burbank, and Norgold).* Not more than "slightly skinned."

(c) *Special purpose shipments.* The minimum grade, size, cleanliness, and maturity requirements set forth in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section shall not be applicable to shipments of seed potatoes or to shipments of potatoes for any of the following purposes:

(1) Livestock feed;

(2) Charity;

(3) Export;

(4) Prepeeling; or

(5) Canning, freezing, and "other processing" as hereinafter defined:

Provided, That shipments of potatoes for the purposes specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), (4), and (5) of this paragraph shall be exempt from inspection requirements specified in § 946.53 and shipments specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (5) of this paragraph shall be exempt from assessment requirements specified in § 946.41.

(d) *Safeguards.* Each handler making shipments of potatoes for export, prepeeling, canning, freezing, or "other processing" pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section, unless such potatoes are handled in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section, shall:

(1) Notify the committee of intent so to ship potatoes by applying on forms furnished by the committee for a certificate applicable to such special purpose shipment;

(2) Obtain a Washington State Shipping Permit as issued by the Washington State Department of Agriculture in lieu of a Federal-State Inspection Certificate, except shipments for export; and

(3) Prepare on forms furnished by the committee a special purpose shipment report on each such shipment. The handler shall forward copies of each such special purpose shipment report to the committee office and to the receiver with instructions to the receiver that he sign and return a copy to the committee office. Failure of the handler or receiver to report such shipments by promptly signing and returning the applicable special purpose shipment report to the committee office shall be cause for cancellation of such handler's certificate applicable to such special purpose shipments and/or the receiver's eligibility to receive further shipments pursuant to such certificate. Upon cancellation of such certificate, the handler may appeal to the committee for reconsideration. Such appeal shall be in writing.

(4) Before diverting any such special purpose shipment from the receiver of record as previously furnished to the committee by the handler, such handler shall submit to the committee a revised special purpose shipment report.

(e) *Special purpose shipments exempt from safeguards.* In the case of shipments of potatoes: (1) To freezers or dehydrators in the counties of Grant, Adams, Franklin, Benton, and Yakima in the State of Washington, and (2) for canning, freezing, dehydration, potato chipping, or prepeeling within the district where grown, the handler of such potatoes shall be exempt from safeguard requirements of paragraph (d) of this section whenever the processor of such potatoes has signed an agreement with the committee to meet the reporting and other requirements of this part specified by the committee.

(f) *Minimum quantity exception.* Each handler may ship up to, but not to exceed 5 hundredweight of potatoes any day without regard to the inspection and assessment requirements of this part, but this exception shall not apply to any shipment of over 5 hundredweight of potatoes.

(g) *Definitions.* The terms "U.S. No. 2," "fairly clean," "slightly skinned," and "moderately skinned" shall have the same meaning as when used in the U.S. Standards for Grades of Potatoes (§§ 51.1540–51.1556 of this title), but on and after September 1, 1971, such terms shall have the same meaning as when used in the said standards, as amended, effective September 1, 1971 (35 F.R. 18257), including the tolerances set forth therein. The term "prepeeling" means potatoes which are clean, sound, fresh tubers prepared commercially in a prepeeling plant by washing, removal of outer skin or peel, trimming, and sorting preparatory to sale in one or more of the styles of peeled potatoes described in § 52.2422 (U.S. Standards for Grades of Peeled Potatoes §§ 52.2421–52.2433 of this title). The term "other Processing" has the same meaning as the term appearing in the Act and includes, but is not restricted to, potatoes for dehydration, chips, shoestrings, starch, and flour. It includes only that preparation of potatoes for market which involves the application of heat or cold to such an extent that the natural form or stability of the commodity undergoes a substantial change. The act of peeling, cooling, slicing, or dicing, or the application of material to prevent oxidation does not constitute "other processing." Other terms used in this section have the same meaning as when used in the marketing agreement and this part.

(h) *Applicability to imports.* Pursuant to section 608e–1 of the Act and § 980.1 *Import regulations* of this chapter (7 CFR 980.1), Irish potatoes of the red skinned round type imported during the months of July and August in the effective period of this section shall meet the minimum grade, size, quality, and maturity requirements specified in this section for round varieties, i.e., in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section.

(Secs. 1–19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601–674)

Dated July 7, 1971, to become effective July 16, 1971.

PAUL A. NICHOLSON,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Consumer and Marketing Service.

[FR Doc.71-9789 Filed 7-9-71;8:49 am]

Title 14—AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

Chapter I—Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation

[Docket No. 10129; Amdts. Nos. 23-11; 25-27, 27-6; 29-7; and 91-90]

ANTICOLLISION LIGHT STANDARDS

The purpose of these amendments is to (1) permit the use of either aviation red or aviation white anticollision light systems; (2) expand the chromaticity-coordinate range for aviation white; (3) increase the minimum effective intensities for anticollision lights installed on all aircraft to be type certificated after the effective date of these amendments; and (4) require that within 1 year after the effective date of these

amendments all powered civil aircraft with standard airworthiness certificates have an approved anticollision light system for night flight.

These amendments are based on a notice of proposed rule making (Notice 70-21) published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on June 4, 1970 (35 F.R. 8665). Numerous comments were received in response to the notice and except to the extent that a comment merely repeated issues which were discussed in detail and properly disposed of in the notice, the FAA's disposition of those comments are set forth hereinafter.

Several comments objected to the requirement that all aircraft flying at night must be fitted with an approved anticollision light. One commentator pointed out that certain operators of small aircraft may fly for a few minutes after dark but only to reach a destination and that such operators should not be burdened with an expensive anticollision light requirement. Another commentator took a similar position with respect to aircraft that are operated at night only in local areas or only in an emergency. The FAA does not agree. With proper flight planning, flight after dark can usually be avoided without inconvenience. Moreover, any aircraft operating at night without an approved anticollision light constitutes a hazard regardless of whether it is being operated in a local area or in an emergency.

One commentator indicated that the FAA may have underestimated the problems associated with removal of the red filter on the anticollision light on existing aircraft. The commentator pointed out that it may be impossible to meet the current field-of-coverage requirements because of the need to mask the unfiltered light to emiminate back-scatter. While the FAA recognizes this problem, it should be noted that it was not proposed to require anyone to remove the red filters on existing aircraft. Moreover, if an operator elected to do so, he would not be required to meet the new intensity requirements. Furthermore, he could relocate the light to minimize the back-scatter problem.

There were numerous comments received in response to Notice 70-21 which recommended changes to the regulations in addition to those proposed in the notice. In this connection, it was recommended that the current field-of-coverage requirements be extended; that the existing flash-frequency requirements be modernized; that exterior minimum intensity requirements be increased beyond the values proposed in the notice; that a red anticollision light be required for nighttime use and a white anticollision light be required for daytime use; and that the operating rule in Part 91 also cover aircraft other than powered civil aircraft with standard airworthiness certificates. While some of these recommendations may have merit, they are beyond the scope of Notice 70-21. However, the FAA is now in the process of investigating and evaluating these recommendations to determine which merit further rule-making action.

One commentator suggested that final action on Notice 70-21 should be deferred until the current FAA/NASA research on aircraft exterior lighting is completed. The FAA does not agree. The changes to the anticollision light requirements proposed in Notice 70-21 are very limited in scope and they are not being dealt with directly in the referenced research. The additional rulemaking that may be generated by the FAA/NASA research would be concerned with the entire area of aircraft exterior lighting and no useful purpose would be served in further delaying the proposed changes.

Several commentators expressed the view that the display of white condenser-discharge anticollision lights significantly reduces the frequency of bird strikes in flight. One respondent submitted statistical data in support of its position and urged that the display of white condenser-discharge lights be made mandatory. The FAA does not agree with these comments. After a thorough review of the data presented, the FAA does not believe that a significant correlation between display of white condenser-discharge lights and frequency of bird strikes has been shown. However, the FAA is continuing its investigation in this area and if further studies reveal that a correlation does exist, it will be the subject of future rulemaking action.

Various comments pointed out that while the notice proposed to require an "approved" anticollision light system, it did not specify the standards for such approval. This appears to be a problem only with respect to anticollision light systems that would have to be installed on aircraft type certificated under airworthiness standards which did not incorporate anticollision light standards. For large aircraft and for certain small aircraft, the operation rules have long required anticollision lights and the airworthiness regulations have long contained standards for such lights. Thus, lights meeting the applicable airworthiness standards are approved lights. In addition, numerous airplanes have, in the past, had anticollision light systems installed voluntarily. All of these systems were approved by the FAA and they continue to be approved. The question as to the identification of approved anticollision light systems arises with respect to the installation of anticollision lights required by this amendment to be installed on aircraft which were certificated under airworthiness standards that did not contain standards for anticollision lights. The FAA is aware that in most instances, the modifications to the older aircraft that would be necessary in order for the anticollision lights to meet the higher intensities proposed in Notice 70-21 would be extensive and may, in certain instances, be prohibitive. This was recognized in the notice and it was not intended that the older aircraft should be required to meet the higher intensities set forth in this amendment. Therefore, the proposal has been revised to make it clear that for the initial installation of anticollision lights on the older aircraft (those for which type certificates were applied for or issued prior to the effective date of this amendment), the anticollision lights would only need to meet the anticollision light standards in Parts 23, 25, 27, or 29, as applicable, effective immediately prior to the effective date of the amendments contained herein.

Another comment expressed an objection to the proposed increase in the intensity level of anticollision light systems for future aircraft on the grounds that for small aircraft using red anticollision lights, power requirements would be unreasonable, service life short and reliability low, and that for small aircraft using the white anticollision lights, it would not be possible to shield them for purposes of back-scatter without a reduction in the required field-of-coverage. The FAA is aware that for red anticollision lights more electrical power would be needed to meet the new requirements than has been provided in the past. However, the FAA believes that this additional power capacity can be provided on future aircraft at reasonable cost, without incurring a low-service-life or low-reliability penalty. Moreover, a manufacturer would now have the option of installing a white anticollision light, thereby eliminating the power problem. The back-scatter problems referred to by the commentator can be solved without diminishing the field-of-coverage by installing a system consisting of three lights, one at each wing-tip and one on the tail.

Finally, one commentator urged the FAA to specify, as part of the revision to the intensity standards for anticollision lights, a minimum infrared signal content for use with PWI systems now under development. This matter was discussed in some detail in Notice 70-21 and the FAA maintains its view that it would be premature to require a minimum infrared signal content until current evaluations by the FAA of the PWI system concept on civil aircraft have been completed. This does not, however, prohibit the incorporation of infrared signal content in any anticollision light system.

In consideration of the foregoing, Parts 23, 25, 27, 29, and 91 of the Federal Aviation Regulations are amended as follows, effective August 11, 1971:

PART 23—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: NORMAL, UTILITY, AND ACROBATIC CATEGORY AIRPLANES

1. Paragraph (c) of § 23.1397 is amended to read as follows:

§ 23.1397 Color specifications.

* * * * *

(c) *Aviation white*—

"x" is not less than 0.300 and not greater than 0.540;

"y" is not less than "$x-0.040$" or "$y_c-0.010$", whichever is the smaller; and

"y" is not greater than "$x+0.020$" nor "$0.636-0.400x$";

Where "y_c" is the "y" coordinate of the Planckian radiator for the value of "x" considered.

2. Paragraphs (d) and (f) of § 23.1401 are revised to read as set forth below and paragraph (e) is amended by adding the parenthetical phrase "(if used)" after the word "filter":

§ 23.1401 Anticollision light system.

* * * * *

(d) *Color.* Each anticollision light must be either aviation red or aviation white and must meet the applicable requirements of § 23.1397.

* * * * *

(f) *Minimum effective intensities for anticollision lights.* Each anticollision light effective intensity must equal or exceed the applicable values in the following table.

Angle above or below the horizontal plane:	*Effective intensity (candles)*
0° to 5°	400
5° to 10°	240
10° to 20°	80
20° to 30°	40

PART 25—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: TRANSPORT CATEGORY AIRPLANES

1. Paragraph (c) of § 25.1397 is amended to read as follows:

§ 25.1397 Color specifications.

(c) *Aviation white—*

"x" is not less than 0.300 and not greater than 0.540;

"y" is not less than "$x-0.040$" or "$y_0-0.010$", whichever is the smaller; and

"y" is not greater than "$x+0.020$" nor "$0.636-0.400x$";

Where "y_0" is the "y" coordinate of the Planckian radiator for the value of "x" considered.

2. Paragraphs (d) and (f) of § 25.1401 are revised to read as set forth below and paragraph (e) is amended by adding the parenthetical phrase "(if used)" after the word "filter":

§ 25.1401 Anticollision light system.

* * * * *

(d) *Color.* Each anticollision light must be either aviation red or aviation white and must meet the applicable requirements of § 25.1397.

* * * * *

(f) *Minimum effective intensities for anticollision lights.* Each anticollision light effective intensity must equal or exceed the applicable values in the following table.

Angle above or below the horizontal plane:	*Effective intensity (candles)*
0° to 5°	400
5° to 10°	240
10° to 20°	80
20° to 30°	40

PART 27—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: NORMAL CATEGORY ROTORCRAFT

1. Paragraph (c) of § 27.1397 is amended to read as follows:

§ 27.1397 Color specifications.

* * * * *

(c) *Aviation white—*

"x" is not less than 0.300 and not greater than 0.540;

"y" is not less than "$x-0.040$" or "$y_0-0.010$", whichever is the smaller; and

"y" is not greater than "$x+0.020$" nor "$0.636-0.400x$";

Where "y_0" is the "y" coordinate of the Planckian radiator for the value of "x" considered.

2. Paragraphs (d) and (f) of § 27.1401 are revised to read as set forth below and paragraph (e) is amended by adding the parenthetical phrase "(if used)" after the word "filter":

§ 27.1401 Anticollision light system.

* * * * *

(d) *Color.* Each anticollision light must be either aviation red or aviation white and must meet the applicable requirements of § 27.1397.

* * * * *

(f) *Minimum effective intensities for anticollision light.* Each anticollision light effective intensity must equal or exceed the applicable values in the following table:

Angle above or below the horizontal plane:	*Effective intensity (candles)*
0° to 5°	400
5° to 10°	240
10° to 20°	80
20° to 30°	40

PART 29—AIRWORTHINESS STANDARDS: TRANSPORT CATEGORY ROTORCRAFT

1. Paragraph (c) of § 29.1397 is amended to read as follows:

§ 29.1397 Color specifications.

* * * * *

(c) *Aviation white—*

"x" is not less than 0.300 and not greater than 0.540;

"y" is not less than "$x-0.040$" or "$y_0-0.010$," whichever is the smaller; and

"y" is not greater than "$x+0.020$" nor "$0.636-0.400x$";

Where "y_0" is the "y" coordinate of the Planckian radiator for the value of "x" considered.

2. Paragraphs (d) and (f) of § 29.1401 are revised to read as set forth below and paragraph (e) is amended by adding the parenthetical phrase "(if used)" after the word "filter":

§ 29.1401 Anticollision light system.

* * * * *

(d) *Color.* Each anticollision light must be either aviation red or aviation white and must meet the applicable requirements of § 29.1397.

* * * * *

(f) *Minimum effective intensities for anticollision lights.* Each anticollision light effective intensity must equal or exceed the applicable values in the following table.

Angle above or below the horizontal plane:	*Effective intensity (candles)*
0° to 5°	400
5° to 10°	240
10° to 20°	80
20° to 30°	40

PART 91—GENERAL OPERATING AND FLIGHT RULES

5. Subparagraph (3) of paragraph (c) of § 91.33 is amended to read as follows:

§ 91.33 Powered civil aircraft with standard category U.S. airworthiness certificates; instrument and equipment requirements.

* * * * *

(c) *Visual flight rules (night).* * * *

(3) An approved aviation red or aviation white anticollision light system on all large aircraft, on all small aircraft when required by the aircraft's airworthiness certificate, and on all other small aircraft after August 11, 1972. Anticollision light systems initially installed after August 11, 1971, on aircraft for which a type certificate was issued or applied for before August 11, 1971, must at least meet the anticollision light standards of Parts 23, 25, 27, or 29, as applicable, that were in effect on August 10, 1971, except that the color may be either aviation red or aviation white. In the event of failure of any light of the anticollision light system, operations with the aircraft may be continued to a stop where repairs or replacement can be made.

* * * * *

(Secs. 313(a), 601, 603, 604, 49 U.S.C. 1354, 1421, 1423, 1424; sec. 6(c), Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on July 1, 1971.

J. H. SHAFFER,
Administrator.

[FR Doc.71-9759 Filed 7-9-71;8:46 am]

[Docket No. 11217; Amdt. No. 764]

PART 97—STANDARD INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURES

Miscellaneous Amendments

This amendment to Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations incorporates by reference therein changes and additions to the Standard Instrument Approach Procedures (SIAPs) that were recently adopted by the Administrator to promote safety at the airports concerned.

The complete SIAPs for the changes and additions covered by this amendment are described in FAA Forms 3139, 8260-3, 8260-4, or 8260-5 and made a part of the public rule making dockets of the FAA in accordance with the procedures set forth in Amendment No. 97-696 (35 F.R. 5609).

SIAPs are available for examination at the Rules Docket and at the National Flight Data Center, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue

SW., Washington, DC 20590. Copies of SIAPs adopted in a particular region are also available for examination at the headquarters of that region. Individual copies of SIAPs may be purchased from the FAA Public Document Inspection Facility, HQ-405, 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, or from the applicable FAA regional office in accordance with the fee schedule prescribed in 49 CFR 7.85. This fee is payable in advance and may be paid by check, draft, or postal money order payable to the Treasurer of the United States. A weekly transmittal of all SIAP changes and additions may be obtained by subscription at an annual rate of $125 per annum from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Since a situation exists that requires immediate adoption of this amendment, I find that further notice and public procedure hereon is impracticable and good cause exists for making it effective in less than 30 days.

In consideration of the foregoing, Part 97 of the Federal Aviation Regulations is amended as follows, effective on the dates specified:

1. Section 97.23 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following VOR-VOR/DME SIAP's, effective August 5, 1971.

Ann Arbor, Mich.—Ann Arbor Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 24, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Charleston, W. Va.—Kanawha Airport; VOR-A, Amdt. 6; Revised.
Charlotte, Mich.—Fitch H. Beach Airport; VOR Runway 20, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Clovis, N. Mex.—Clovis Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 21, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Dallas, Tex.—Dallas Garland Airport; VOR Runway 13, Original; Established.
Dallas, Tex.—Dallas Garland Airport; VOR Runway 31, Original; Established.
Dickinson, N. Dak.—Dickinson Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 17, Amdt. 9; Revised.
Duluth, Minn.—Duluth International Airport; VOR Runway 3, Amdt. 8; Revised.
Elgin, Ill.—Elgin Airport; VOR-A, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Fairmont, Minn.—Fairmont Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 31, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Galesburg, Ill.—Galesburg Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 2, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Galesburg, Ill.—Galesburg Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 20, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Hastings, Nebr.—Hastings Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 14, Amdt. 8; Revised.
Hastings, Nebr.—Hastings Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 32, Amdt. 6; Revised.
Indianapolis, Ind.—Indianapolis Terry Airport; VOR Runway 36, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Janesville, Wis.—Rock County Airport; VOR Runway 4, Amdt. 13; Revised.
Lake Charles, La.—Lake Charles Municipal Airport; VOR-A, Amdt. 7; Revised.
Lake City, Fla.—Lake City Municipal Airport; VOR-A, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Lambertville, Mich.—Wagonwheel Airport; VOR-1, Original; Canceled.
Newton, Iowa—Newton Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 13, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Newton, Iowa—Newton Municipal Airport; VOR Runway 31, Amdt. 2; Revised.
North Platte, Nebr.—Lee Bird Field; VOR Runway 35, Amdt. 12; Revised.
Oak Bluffs, Mass.—Oak Bluffs Airport; VOR-A, Amdt. 1; Canceled.
Ottumwa, Iowa—Ottumwa Industrial Airport; VOR Runway 31, Amdt. 9; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; VOR Runway 6, Amdt. 1; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; VOR Runway 12R, Amdt. 12; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; VOR Runway 12L, Amdt. 3; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; VOR Runway 24, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; VOR Runway 16R, Amdt. 13; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; VOR Runway 16L, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Sarasota (Bradenton), Fla.—Sarasota-Bradenton Airport; VOR Runway 13, Amdt. 9; Revised.
Sarasota (Bradenton), Fla.—Sarasota-Bradenton Airport; VOR Runway 22, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Sarasota (Bradenton), Fla.—Sarasota-Bradenton Airport; VOR Runway 31, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Yakima, Wash.—Yakima Municipal Airport; VOR A, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Ann Arbor, Mich.—Ann Arbor Municipal Airport; VOR/DME Runway 6, Original; Established.
Duluth, Minn.—Duluth International Airport; VOR/DME Runway 21, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Fort Worth, Tex.—Greater Southwest International Dallas-Fort Worth Field; VOR/DME Runway 35, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Hobbs, N. Mex.—Crossroads Intercontinental Airport; VOR/DME Runway 21, Original; Established.
Houston, Tex.—Houston Intercontinental Airport; VOR/DME Runway 14, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Janesville, Wis.—Rock County Airport; VOR/DME Runway 22, Amdt. 4; Revised.
Lake Charles, La.—Lake Charles Municipal Airport; VOR/DME-A, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Ottumwa, Iowa—Ottumwa Industrial Airport; VOR/DME Runway 13, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; VOR/DME Runway 34L, Amdt. 7; Revised.
Yakima, Wash.—Yakima Municipal Airport; VOR/DME Runway 27, Amdt. 1; Revised.

3. Section 97.25 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following LOC-LDA SIAPs, effective August 5, 1971.

Columbus, Miss.—Golden Triangle Regional Airport; LOC Runway 18, Original; Canceled.
Duluth, Minn.—Duluth International Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 27, Amdt. 4; Revised.
Grand Rapids, Mich.—Kent County Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 8, Amdt. 6; Revised.
Lake Charles, La.—Lake Charles Municipal Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 33, Amdt. 8; Revised.
Lansing, Mich.—Capital City Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 9, Amdt. 10; Revised.
Parkersburg, W. Va.—Wood County Airport/Gill Robb Wilson Field; LOC Runway 3, Amdt. 2; Canceled.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 6, Amdt. 19; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 30L, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; LOC (BC) Runway 16R, Amdt. 9; Revised.
Yakima, Wash.—Yakima Municipal Airport; LOC/DME (BC) Runway 9, Amdt. 1; Revised.

4. Section 97.27 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following NDB/ADF SIAPs, effective July 22, 1971.

Eagle River, Wis.—Eagle River Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 23, Original; Established.

5. Section 97.27 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following NDB/ADF SIAPs, effective August 5, 1971.

Adrian, Mich.—The Lenawee County Airport; NDB Runway 5, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Appleton, Wis.—Outagamie County Airport; NDB Runway 2, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Charleston, W. Va.—Kanawha Airport; NDB (ADF) Runway 23, Amdt. 16; Canceled.
Clintonville, Wis.—Clintonville Airport; NDB Runway 32, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Connersville, Ind.—Mettel Field; NDB Runway 18, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Duluth, Minn.—Duluth International Airport; NDB Runway 9, Amdt. 10; Revised.
East St. Louis, Ill.—Bi-State Parks Airport; NDB Runway 30, Amdt. 2; Revised.
Hastings, Nebr.—Hastings Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 14, Amdt. 5; Revised.
Keokuk, Iowa—Keokuk Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 13, Amdt. 4; Revised.
Lake Charles, La.—Lake Charles Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 15, Amdt. 11; Revised.
North Platte, Nebr.—Lee Bird Field; NDB (ADF)-2 Runway 30, Original; Canceled.
North Platte, Nebr.—Lee Bird Field; NDB Runway 30, Amdt. 2; Revised.
North Platte, Nebr.—Lee Bird Field; NDB (ADF)-1 Runway 35, Amdt. 3; Canceled.
North Platte, Nebr.—Lee Bird Field; NDB Runway 35, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Oak Bluffs, Mass.—Oak Bluffs Airport; NDB-A, Amdt. 1; Canceled.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; NDB Runway 12R, Amdt. 4; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; NDB Runway 24, Amdt. 26; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; NDB Runway 34L, Amdt. 5; Revised.
Webster City, Iowa—Webster City Municipal Airport; NDB Runway 32, Amdt. 2; Revised.

6. Section 97.29 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following ILS SIAP's, effective August 5, 1971.

Appleton, Wis.—Outagamie County Airport; ILS Runway 2, Amdt. 1; Revised.
Charleston, W. Va.—Kanawha Airport; ILS Runway 23, Amdt. 19; Revised.
Duluth, Minn.—Duluth International Airport; ILS Runway 9, Amdt. 5; Revised.
Fort Lauderdale, Fla.—Fort Lauderdale Hollywood International Airport; ILS Runway 9L, Amdt. 3; Revised.
Lake Charles, La.—Lake Charles Municipal Airport; ILS Runway 15, Amdt. 11; Revised.
New York, N.Y.—John F. Kennedy International Airport; ILS Runway 4L, Original; Established.
Parkersburg, W. Va.—Wood County Airport/Gill Robb Wilson Field; ILS Runway 3, Original; Established.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; ILS Runway 12R, Amdt. 7; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; ILS Runway 24, Amdt. 31; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; ILS Runway 34L, Amdt. 26; Revised.
Waterloo, Iowa—Waterloo Municipal Airport; ILS Runway 12, Amdt. 11; Revised.
Yakima, Wash.—Yakima Municipal Airport; ILS Runway 27, Amdt. 17; Revised.

7. Section 97.31 is amended by establishing, revising, or canceling the following Radar SIAPs, effective August 5, 1971.

Charleston, W. Va.—Kanawha Airport; Radar-1, Amdt. 6; Revised.
Duluth, Minn.—Duluth International Airport; Radar-1, Amdt. 5; Revised.
St. Louis, Mo.—St. Louis International Airport; Radar-1, Amdt. 14; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; Radar-1, Amdt. 9; Revised.
Salt Lake City, Utah—Salt Lake City International Airport; Radar-2, Amdt. 1; Revised.

(Secs. 307, 313, 601, 1110, Federal Aviation Act of 1958; 49 U.S.C. 1438, 1354, 1421, 1510, sec. 6(c) Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. 1655(c) and 5 U.S.C. 552(a)(1))

Issued in Washington, D.C., on July 2, 1971.

R. S. SLIFF,
Acting Director,
Flight Standards Service.

NOTE: Incorporation by reference provisions in §§ 97.10 and 97.20 (35 F.R. 5610) approved by the Director of the Federal Register on May 12, 1969.

[FR Doc.71-9656 Filed 7-9-71;8:45 am]

Title 21—FOOD AND DRUGS

Chapter I—Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

SUBCHAPTER B—FOOD AND FOOD PRODUCTS

PART 121—FOOD ADDITIVES

Subpart A—Definitions and Procedural and Interpretative Regulations

ELIGIBILITY OF SUBSTANCES FOR CLASSIFICATION AS GENERALLY RECOGNIZED AS SAFE IN FOOD

Correction

In F.R. Doc. 71-8976 appearing at page 12093 in the issue for Friday, June 25, 1971, the following changes should be made in § 121.3:

1. In paragraph (b)(2)(i) the following words should be inserted between the third and fourth lines: "introduction into commercial use after".

2. In paragraph (b)(2)(iv) the word "or" in the fourth line should be "of".

SUBCHAPTER C—DRUGS

PART 135—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS

Subpart C—Sponsors of Approved Applications

PART 135b—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS FOR IMPLANTATION OR INJECTION

Iron Dextran Complex

The Commissioner of Food and Drugs has evaluated a supplemental new animal drug application (12-571V) filed by John D. Copanos & Co., Inc., proposing the safe and effective use of iron dextran complex for preventing anemia and reducing losses due to iron deficiency in baby pigs. The application is approved.

To facilitate referencing, John D. Copanos & Co., Inc., is being assigned a code number and placed in the list of firms in § 135.501 (21 CFR 135.501).

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 512(i), 82 Stat. 347; 21 U.S.C. 360b(i)) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), Parts 135 and 135b are amended as follows:

1. Section 135.501 is amended in paragraph (c) by adding a new code number 054, as follows:

§ 135.501 Names, addresses, and code numbers of sponsors of approved applications.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

Code No.	*Firm name and address*
* * *	* * *
054	John D. Copanos & Co., Inc., Baltimore, Md. 21225.

2. Part 135b is amended by adding the following new section:

§ 135b.38 Iron dextran complex injection.

(a) *Specifications.* Iron dextran complex injection contains ferric hydroxide dextran complex with 0.5 percent phenol as a preservative. It is sterile and each cubic centimeter contains 100 milligrams of elemental iron.

(b) *Sponsor.* See code number 054 in § 135.501(c) of this chapter.

(c) *Conditions of use.* It is used in baby pigs as follows:

(1) For the prevention of anemia due to iron deficiency, administer an initial intramuscular injection of 75 to 150 milligrams of elemental iron to each animal at 2 to 4 days of age. Dosage may be repeated in 14 to 21 days.

(2) For the treatment of anemia due to iron deficiency, administer an intramuscular injection of 100 to 200 milligrams of elemental iron.

Effective date. This order shall be effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (7-10-71).

(Sec. 512(i), 82 Stat. 347; 21 U.S.C. 360b(i))

Dated: July 2, 1971.

FRED J. KINGMA,
Acting Director,
Bureau of Veterinary Medicine.

[FR Doc.71-9758 Filed 7-9-71;8:46 am]

PART 135c—NEW ANIMAL DRUGS IN ORAL DOSAGE FORMS

Combination Drug

The Commissioner of Food and Drugs has evaluated a supplemental new animal drug application (35-263V) filed by American Cyanamid Co., Post Office Box 400, Princeton, N.J. 08540, proposing the safe and effective use of a combination drug containing styrylpyridinium chloride and diethylcarbamazine (as base) as an aid in the prevention of heartworm disease in dogs. The application is approved.

Therefore, pursuant to provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (sec. 512(i), 82 Stat. 347; 21 U.S.C. 360b(i)) and under authority delegated to the Commissioner (21 CFR 2.120), Part 135c is amended in § 135c.25 by revising paragraph (d) to read as follows:

§ 135c.25 Styrylpyridinium chloride, diethylcarbamazine (as base).

* * * * *

(d) *Conditions of use.* (1) It is used or intended for use by oral administration to dogs for the control of hookworms (*Ancylostoma caninum*) and roundworms (*Toxocara canis*) and as an aid in the prevention of heartworm disease (*Dirofilaria immitis*).

(2) During period of exposure to heartworm, hookworm, and/or roundworm infection, administer the drug in food daily at 1 cubic centimeter per 20 pounds of body weight. Periodic examinations for hookworms, large roundworms, and heartworms should be made to assure that medication is given properly. Dogs with established heartworm infections should not be treated with the drug until they have been converted to a negative status. Administration to heartworm infected dogs may cause adverse reactions due to pulmonary occlusion.

(3) For use only by or on the order of a licensed veterinarian.

Effective date. This order shall be effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER (7-10-71).

(Sec. 512(i), 82 Stat. 347; 21 U.S.C. 360b(i))

Dated: July 2, 1971.

FRED J. KINGMA,
Acting Director,
Bureau of Veterinary Medicine.

[FR Doc.71-9757 Filed 7-9-71;8:46 am]

Title 26—INTERNAL REVENUE

Chapter I—Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury

SUBCHAPTER A—INCOME TAX

[T.D. 7128]

PART 1—INCOME TAX; TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1953

Depreciation Allowances Using Asset Depreciation Range System

Correction

In F.R. Doc. 71-8981 appearing at page 11924 in the issue of Wednesday, June 23, 1971, the fourth line of § 1.167(a)-11(d)(2)(iv) reading "and 263, the taxpayer pays or incurs any" should read "and 263, if the taxpayer pays or incurs any".